DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 753 CS 506 964

AUTHOR Gardner, Greg H.
TITLE First Gentleman of the World: The Eulogistic Rhetoric of Adlai Ewing Stevenson.
PUB DATE 21 Nov 89
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (75th, San Francisco, CA, November 18-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; Discourse Analysis; *Persuasive Discourse; Public Speaking; Rhetorical Criticism; Speeches; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Eulogies; Oratory; Rhetorical Strategies; *Stevenson (Adlai II)

ABSTRACT

A study examined three eulogies offered by Adlai Stevenson upon the deaths of important public figures (Eleanor Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Sir Winston Churchill), in order to determine how each address fulfilled the purposes of this unique rhetorical genre. Each eulogy was examined with the purposes of eulogistic speaking in mind: (1) to express appropriate personal and audience grief; (2) to deepen appreciation and respect for the deceased; and (3) to give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future. Findings indicated that Stevenson attempted to fulfill each purpose of eulogistic speaking in each of the eulogies, with certain paragraphs of each eulogy clearly devoted to each of the three purposes. Moreover, Stevenson devoted approximately 80% of his speaking time to the second purpose, with the rest of the time of each eulogy somewhat equally divided between the other two purposes. (Thirty-nine notes are included, and the three eulogies are attached.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313753

FIRST GENTLEMAN OF THE WORLD: THE EULOGISTIC RHETORIC OF ADLAI EWING STEVENSON

The Art of Persuasion--The Beautiful and the Just:
Papers in Honor of Raymond Yeager
Speech Communication Association 75th Annual Convention
San Francisco, California
November 21, 1989

Greg H. Gardner, Ph.D.
Rollins College
Winter Park, FL

CS506964

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Greg H. Gardner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Immediately after the death of Adlai Ewing Stevenson on July 23, 1965, Secretary of State Dean Rusk eulogized him at the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York City by calling him

> a universal man whose universality did not rest upon his being a prince among plain men, but upon his being a plain man even among princes. 1

Rusk concluded his address to the assembled delegates by saying, "Three presidents of the United States sent Adlai Stevenson to the United Nations. They sent you our best." 2

At approximately the same time, William Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, upon hearing of Stevenson's death, observed that Stevenson "would have known something to say to take the sting out of it." 3

It seems clear, in retrospect, that Adlai Stevenson certainly would have known something to say in his own eulogy since this significant American politician, statesman, and orator was one of the most preeminent speakers of this rhetorical type in our nation's history. Indeed, Brownlow and Davis conclude that

> the eulogies (of Stevenson) are models of excellence for this oratorical genre (and are) already included by Stevenson and various editors in anthologies and collections...they are among the best set of eulogies by a single speaker in American public address. 4

Adlai Ewing Stevenson was born to affluence and influence. His paternal grandfather, the first Adlai Stevenson, was Vice-President of the United States in Grover Cleveland's second administration, and his maternal great-grandfather, Jesse Fell, helped arrange the Lincoln-Douglas Debates. 5 Educated at Princeton University and Northwestern Law School, Stevenson served his state and nation as Governor of Illinois from 1948-1952, Democratic nominee for President of the United States in 1952 and 1956, and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. It was during this tenure as head of the United States delegation to the U.N. that Stevenson was asked to deliver eulogies upon the deaths of three important world figures.

The subjects of these three eulogies were: a representative to the United Nations and the wife of a United States President, Eleanor Roosevelt; a President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; and a Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill. The eulogy for Eleanor Roosevelt was delivered at the largest memorial service for Mrs. Roosevelt which was held at the Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine in New York City on November 7, 1962; the eulogy for President Kennedy was presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 26, 1963; and the eulogy for Prime Minister Churchill was delivered at the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C. on January 28, 1965. Stevenson had been a close personal friend of Mrs. Roosevelt for many years, had served as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. under President Kennedy, and was very well acquainted with Churchill.

Thus, because of personal friendships, because of his position as U.N. Ambassador, and because of his well-known and respected rhetorical ability, Adlai Stevenson was chosen to pay tribute.

This study analyzes these three eulogies in order to determine how each address fulfilled the purposes of this unique rhetorical genre. It would seem an important contribution to the field of rhetorical thought if it could be determined whether a speaker of Stevenson's stature delivered eulogies with specific purposes in mind. Brownlow and Davis indicate that Stevenson was well aware of the inherent purposes of eulogies. 6 The eulogist's general thesis is "Here is a person deserving to be remembered, and these are the reasons why that is true." 7 Speech communication scholars have indicated that the eulogy has three inherent purposes: (1) to express appropriate personal and audience grief, (2) to deepen appreciation and respect for the deceased and (3) to give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future. 8

While Stevenson delivered eulogies for other famous and not-as-famous people and also delivered other eulogies for both Eleanor Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, these speeches were chosen for analysis because they are representative of his eulogistic oratory, because they were delivered within a short time period of only two years, and because they are among the main tributes to international figures eulogized by Stevenson while he was U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The Eulogy as a Form of Public Address

The eulogy has long been recognized as an important part of the art of speechmaking. Certainly it is true that "death always calls for ritualistic confirmation of the worth of the deceased and a eulogy or public statement of some kind." 9 In the Rhetoric, Aristotle confirmed that ceremonial speaking, of which the eulogy is a specific type, is one of the three important kinds of rhetoric along with political and forensic rhetoric. 10 Indeed, the eulogy comprised the greater part of ceremonial speaking among the ancients. 11 Generally, the purpose of such demonstrative speeches is to impress the audience which, in general, means to move, to touch, to affect the spirit of the audience. 12

Each of the aforementioned purposes is equally important to the critical success of the address. First, it is important for the speaker delivering a eulogy to express the grief felt by both the audience and the speaker and, if necessary, to communicate that it is fitting and proper to so grieve. This grieving process is a critical part of allowing the living to begin the healing process so necessary in dealing with death. Second, the speaker must deepen appreciation and respect for the deceased. While it is true that in some eulogy-situations the audience may not appreciate or respect the person who has just died because they did not individually know or personally like the deceased very well, usually the members of this audience have a high regard, perhaps even a reverence, for the deceased. Third, the person delivering

the eulogy must give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future. Often the final section of the eulogy, this part is very important. Faced with what is perceived by many as an almost inherently sad message, the eulogist must indicate to the audience that, despite this person's death, life for the rest of us will continue.

The Eleanor Roosevelt Eulogy

Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of former President of the United States Franklin Roosevelt, world-respected humanitarian, and a tireless worker for the United Nations, died on November 7, 1962. Upon hearing of her death, Adlai Stevenson stated perhaps the most eloquent of all the tributes as he said, "She would rather light candles than curse the darkness." He repeated the sentence a day later at the United Nations as he delivered the first of five eulogies he would present for this famous lady of the world. 13

It was, however, the second of these eulogies which was to become the most noticed and critically acclaimed. This largest of the memorial services for Mrs. Roosevelt was held at the Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine on November 17, 1962. Stevenson, wearing a scarlet academic robe, spoke from the pulpit of the cathedral to the assembled audience as:

> ten thousand persons, including Americans and foreign diplomats, filled the Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine yesterday at a memorial service for Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt...The Protestant Episcopal cathedral was crowded with young and old of all races and from all walks of life--women in furs and others in inexpensive cloth coats, whites, Negroes, and Asians. Every seat was occupied. Scores stood in the rear and in the aisles. 14

These people came to hear Adlai Stevenson eulogize Eleanor Roosevelt and, unknown to them at the time, to fulfill each of the three purposes of any eulogy. First, Stevenson attempted to accomplish the initial purpose of eulogistic speaking of expressing appropriate personal and audience grief by showing his listeners that it was all right to grieve and to express that grief. Of the three eulogies studied, Stevenson spent more time in this eulogy on this purpose than in any of the other speeches. He stated:

> In gathering here to honor her, we engage in a self-serving act. It is we who are trying, by this ceremony of tribute, to deny the fact that we have lost her, and, at least, to prolong the farewell... A grief perhaps not equalled since the death of her husband seventeen years ago is the world's best tribute to one of the great figures of our age... 15

Later, at the beginning of his conclusion, Stevenson returned to the fulfilling of this purpose of grieving by saying:

> So we must say farewell. We are always saying farewell in this world--always standing at the edge of loss attempting to retrieve some memory, some human meanin, from the silence--something which was precious and is gone. 16

He concluded the address by, once again, returning to this purpose of grief-expression by saying:

> Today we weep for ourselves. We are lonelier; someone has gone from one's own life--who was like the certainty of refuge; and someone has gone from the world--who was like a certainty of honor. 17

Stevenson also attempted to accomplish the second purpose of eulogies by deepening appreciation and respect for the deceased. The fulfilling of this purpose consumed by far the largest amount of time spent in this particular eulogy. Paragraph after paragraph were developed describing the significant attributes of Mrs. Roosevelt; approximately 80% of the eulogy was devoted to fulfilling this purpose. For instance, after the introduction to his presentation, Stevenson said:

> She lived 78 years, most of the time in tireless activity as if she knew that only a frail fragment of the things that cry out to be done could be done in the lifetime of even the most fortunate. 18

Attempting to express the multitude of goodness performed by Mrs. Roosevelt in her lifetime, Stevenson went on by saying:

> Yet how much she had done--how much still unchronicled! We dare not try to tabulate the lives she salvaged, the battles--known and unrecorded--she fought, the afflicted she comforted, the hovels she brightened, the faces and places, near and far, that were given some new radiance, some sound and music, by her endeavors. What other human being has touched and transformed the existence of so many others? What better measure is there of the impact of anyone's life? 19

Returning to her good works, in an attempt to deepen the appreciation for her, Stevenson observed that:

> There was no sick soul too wounded to engage her mercy. There was no signal of human distress which she did not view as a personal summons...she walked in the slums and ghettos of the world, not on a tour of inspection, nor as a condescending patron, but as one who could not feel complacent while others were hungry, and who could not find contentment while others were in distress. This was not sacrifice; this, for Mrs. Roosevelt, was the only meaningful way of life. 20

The third purpose of the eulogy, to give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future, was also fulfilled by Stevenson. As is so often the case with this type of speaking, this purpose was achieved in the latter part of the speech where the speaker can leave the audience with a positive message. In his Roosevelt eulogy, Stevenson strived to fulfill this purpose by stating:

> Not long before she died, she wrote that 'within all of us there are two sides. One reaches for the stars, the other descends to the level of beasts.' It was, I think, this discernment that made her so unfailingly tolerant of friends who faltered, and led her so often to remind the smug and the complacent that 'There but for the grace of God...' 21

Later on, Stevenson stated Mrs. Roosevelt's view of life in an obvious effort to not only describe her but to bring her strength to the audience for them to use now and in the future:

> 'Life,' she said, 'was meant to be lived.' A simple statement. An obvious statement. But a statement that by its obviousness and its simplicity challenges the most intricate of all the philosophies of despair. 22

Toward the end of the speech, Stevenson again returns to this theme by asking the audience to remember the strength of Eleanor Roosevelt and, implicitly, urges the hearers summon up that same strength. He stated:

> What we have lost in Eleanor Roosevelt is not her life. She lived that out to the full. What we have lost, what we wish to recall for ourselves, to remember, is what she was herself. And who can name it? But she left 'a name to shine on the entablatures of truth, forever.' 23

The John F. Kennedy Eulogy

One year and fifteen days after Eleanor Roosevelt died, the world was shocked as President John F. Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas. Upon hearing the news, Adlai Stevenson returned to his office and issued a personal statement just as he had done upon hearing the news of Mrs. Roosevelt's death. He stated:

> The tragedy of this day is beyond instant comprehension. All of us who knew him will bear the grief of this death to the day of ours. And all men everywhere who love peace and justice and freedom will bow their heads. 24

Stevenson was called upon at other times to eulogize this fallen President but none of his eulogies of Kennedy received more recognition that his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 26, 1963. As one of more than thirty speakers who expressed grief that day, Ambassador Stevenson was asked to do more than the other speakers because the assembled delegates as well as the world's citizens anxiously waited to learn of America's directions in the days following the assassination as well as to hear Stevenson eulogize his President.

Perhaps because of the profound grief felt by the people at this time, Stevenson clearly attempted to fulfill the first purpose of eulogistic speaking, the necessity to express appropriate personal and audience grief. Stevenson observed this concept of grief in only two sections of his speech but he chose to fulfill this purpose with his introductory remarks by saying:

> My privilege in this sad hour is to convey to you, Mr. President, to you, Mr. Secretary-General, and to you, the assembled delegates of the world, the profound gratitude of the people of my country for what has been done and for what has been said here today. Our grief is the more bearable because it is so widely and so genuinely shared; and for this we can only say, simply, but from the depths of our full hearts, thank you. 25

Later, Stevenson observes the mourning and grieving of the world by stating one of the more memorable passages of his eulogy:

> Our grief is compounded by the bitter irony that he who gave his all to contain violence, lost his all--to violence. Now he is gone. Today we mourn him. Tomorrow and tomorrow we shall miss him. And so we shall never know how different the world might have been had fate permitted this blazing talent to live and labor longer at man's unfinished agenda for peace and progress for all. 26

Just as he did in the Roosevelt eulogy, Stevenson spent the most time developing the second purpose of eulogy speaking, the deepening of appreciation and respect for the deceased. In the third paragraph of the speech, Stevenson generalized about Kennedy's abilities by saying:

> Never once did he lose his way in the maze; never once did he falter in the storm of spears; never once was he intimidated. Like the ancient prophets he loved the people enough to warn them of their errors. And the man who loves his country best will hold it to its highest standards. He made us proud to be Americans. 27

In paragraphs five through nine, Stevenson summarized the accomplishments of President Kennedy. Using the rhetorical device of anaphora, he recalled these deeds by introducing each paragraph with the words, "We shall not soon forget..." For example, he spoke of Kennedy's view of America by saying:

> We shall not soon forget the late President's driving ambition for his own country--his concept of a permanently dynamic society spreading abundance to the last corner of this land and extending justice, tolerance, and dignity to all of its citizens alike. 28

Similarly, Stevenson spoke of the President's use of the moderation of power on the world stage by observing:

> We shall not soon forget that as the leader of a great nation he met and mastered his responsibility to wield great power with great restraint. 'Our national strength matters,' he said just a few weeks ago, 'but the spirit which informs and controls our strength matters just as much.' 29

Finally, in an important reference to his immediate audience, Stevenson deepened their appreciation and respect for the President by saying:

> We shall not soon forget that by word and by deed he gave proof of profound confidence in the present value and the future promise of this great organization, the United Nations. 30

The third purpose of a eulogy, to give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future, was also a very important aspect of this eulogy. Because of the uncertainty involved whenever a leader of a significant nation dies and because of the ramifications of the Cold War at that time, it was vitally necessary for Stevenson to reassure the assembled delegates of the United Nations and the rest of the world that the United States was not about to undertake major changes in its foreign policy.

Therefore, the speaker went on at great lengths to provide such a reassurance; five paragraphs of the speech, nearly one-half of the presentation, were devoted to carrying out this third purpose.

He began this section of the speech by indicating that while President Kennedy lived no longer, the rest of the people did and that his death should not deter us from what had to be done. He said:

> Yet for the rest of us, life goes on; our agenda remains unfinished. Minutes after his spirit departed, Lyndon B. Johnson took his oath of allegiance to the permanent institutions of the country, institutions which outlast violence and outlive men. These hours of mourning are then but a pause in a process--not a break in purpose or in policy. 31

Again addressing his immediate audience of the delegates to the United Nations, he sought to reaffirm the United States policy toward that body by saying:

> President Johnson has directed me to affirm that there will be no Johnson policy toward the United Nations, any more than there was a Kennedy policy. There was--and is--only a United States policy. And that, too, outlasts violence and outlives men. 32

Following up on this reassurance, and in an obvious attempt to give the audience--present and elsewhere--strength for the present and inspiration for the future, Stevenson concluded his eulogy by saying:

> Finally, let me say, as several speakers have reminded us here this afternoon, that John Kennedy never believed that he or any man was indispensable; of Dag Hammarskjold's death he said, 'The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this Organization.' But he did believe passionately that peace and justice are indispensable. And he believed, as he told this Assembly in 1961, that 'in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war...'
>
> So, my friends, we shall honor him in the best way that lies open to us--and the way he would want it to be--by getting on with the everlasting search for peace and justice for which all mankind is praying. 33

The Sir Winston Churchill Eulogy

A little more than a year later, and only six months before his own death, Adlai Stevenson was asked once again to eulogize one of the world's great citizens. Sir Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain during World War II, author, orator, and statesman, died on January 24, 1965. Four days later, Stevenson spoke to over three thousand persons at the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C.

Stevenson fulfilled the first purpose of the eulogy, to express appropriate personal and audience grief only once in this eulogy, but he chose the first paragraph of his speech to do so. In his eloquent manner, Stevenson indicated to his audience why it was right for them to grieve by saying:

> Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialogue is diminished and the sources or public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky...So we are right to mourn. 34

Just as he had done in the Eleanor Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy eulogies, Stevenson spent the majority of his eulogy of Churchill by fulfilling the second purpose of eulogy speaking, deepening appreciation and respect for the deceased. As he did in previous eulogies, Stevenson began this deepening of appreciation and respect in a general way by philosophizing about Churchill's life as he stated:

> Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and the power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and the reach of human achievement. 35

Next, Stevenson recalled Churchill's uplifting oratory in the winning of World War II. The eulogist continued:

> It was his lonely voice that in the Thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor. It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady throughout the last decades...He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. 36

Toward the end of the eulogy, Stevenson summarized the life of Churchill in one of his most eloquent passages as he, once again, strived to deepen his audience's appreciation and respect for the deceased. He said:

> The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit--yes, and the dedicated bricklayer--behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power. 37

The fulfillment of the third purpose of the eulogy, to give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future, was achieved twice in the Churchill eulogy. Stevenson urged to audience to feel celebration as well as sadness by saying in the last sentence of the third paragraph:

> We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they 'now praise famous men' and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate. 37

Toward the end of the eulogy, Stevenson once again sought to encourage and inspire the audience by referring to the concept of a faith in God. He stated:

> In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: 'I do not believe that God has despaired of his children.' And in old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: 'Only faith,' he said, 'in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again--only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation.' 38

Conclusion

Adlai Ewing Stevenson ranks as one of America's great orators. Certainly, he was one of the very best of our eulogistic speakers as he was chosen to deliver eulogies, perhaps more than any other orator, at the deaths of some of the most important people of his time.

These choices were made, it seems, not only because Stevenson, himself, was a world figure; nor were they made simply because he was an outstanding orator. They were made, in a deliberate way, because Stevenson was uniquely the type of person who should have been chosen to deliver eulogies for outstanding citizens--famous in his own right, outstanding in his oratory, compassionate in his feelings, and respecting of all human life. He was:

> ...simply better fitted by training and temperament to make excellent responses to these rhetorical situations than many of the (other) situations he had encountered. As a result, the eulogies are models of excellence for this oratorical genre. 39

Stevenson was well aware of how to deliver an effective eulogy and was well-schooled in the purposes of a eulogy. Speech communication research indicates that there are three purposes which all eulogies can fulfill: (1) to express appropriate personal and audience grief, (2) to deepen appreciation and respect for the deceased and (3) to give the audience strength for the present and inspiration for the future. This study analyzed the eulogies of Adlai Stevenson at the deaths of Eleanor Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Winston Churchill.

Among the major findings was that Stevenson attempted to fulfill each purpose of eulogistic speaking in each of the eulogies. Clearly, certain paragraphs of each eulogy were devoted to each of the three purposes.

In terms of the time spent for each of the purposes, Stevenson devoted much more speaking time--approximately 80 %--to the second purpose, the deepening of appreciation and respect for the deceased, while he spent the rest of the time of each eulogy somewhat equally divided between the other two purposes.

Finally, rhetorical scholars can learn much by studying the art form perfected. They clearly could do so, in the oratorical genre of eulogistic speaking, by studying Adlai Ewing Stevenson.

ENDNOTES

1. Francis Plimpton, "They Sent You Our Best" in As We Knew Ye, ed. Edward P. Doyle (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966) 256.

2. Plimpton 256.

3. Man of Honor, Man of Peace: The Life and Words of Adlai Stevenson, ed. Editors of Country Beautiful (New York: Putnams, 1965) 3.

4. Paul C. Brownlow and Beth Davis, "A Certainty of Honor: The Eulogies of Adlai Stevenson," Central States Speech Journal XXV. 3 (Fall, 1974): 224.

5. James H. McBath, "The War or Peace Alternative," Great Speeches For Criticism and Analysis, ed. Lloyd Rohler and Roger Cook (Greenwood, IN: Alistair Press, 1988) 167.

6. Brownlow and Davis 219.

7. William Norwood Brigance, Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society, 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961) 499.

8. Edward Rogge and James C. Ching, Advanced Public Speaking (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966) 434-450. Giles Wilson Gray and Waldo W. Braden, Public Speaking: Principles and Practice, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 383-385. Ralph Borden Culp, Basic Types of Speech (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown, 1968) 75-78.

9. Brownlow and Davis 220.

10. Aristotle, Rhetoric, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (Franklin Center, PA: The Franklin Library, 1981) 16.

11. William Norwood Brigance, The Spoken Word (New York: F.S. Crofts and Co., 1928) 306.

12. Robert G. King, Forms of Public Address (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1969) 58.

13. King 82

14. "10,000 Attend Memorial Service for Mrs. Roosevelt," The New York Times 18 Nov. 1962: 71.

15. King 83

16. King 86

17. King 87

18. King 83-84

19. King 84

20. King 84

21. King 84

22. King 86

23. King 87

24. Adlai Stevenson, Looking Outward: Years of Crisis at the United Nations (New York: Harper and Row, 1961) 113.

25. The Department of State Bulletin, XLIX, 1276, 9 December, 1963: 894.

26. The Department of State Bulletin 895.

27. The Department of State Bulletin 894.

28. The Department of State Bulletin 894.

29. The Department of State Bulletin 894.

30. The Department of State Bulletin 894.

31. The Department of State Bulletin 895.

32. The Department of State Bulletin 895.

33. The Department of State Bulletin 895

34. Wil Linkugel, R.R. Allen, and Richard Johannsen, Contemporary American Speeches (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1978) 374.

35. Linkugel 374.

36. Linkugel 374-375.

37. Linkugel 376.

38. Linkugel 376.

39. Brownlow and Davis 224.

EULOGY FOR ELEANOR ROOSEVELT
CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK
NOVEMBER 17, 1962

One week ago, in the rose garden at Hyde Park, Eleanor Roosevelt came home for the last time. Her journeys are over. The remembrance now begins.

In gathering here to honor her, we engage in a self-serving act. It is we who are trying, by this ceremony of tribute, to deny the fact that we have lost her, and, at least, to prolong the farewell, and--possibly--to say some of the things we dared not say in her presence, because she would have turned aside such testimonial with impatience and gently asked us to get on with some of the more serious business of the meeting.

A grief perhaps not equaled since the death of her husband seventeen years ago is the world's best tribute to one of the great figures of our age--a woman whose lucid and luminous faith testified always for sanity in an insane time and for hope in a time of obscure hope--a woman who spoke for the good toward which man aspires in a world which has known too much of the evil of which man is capable.

She lived 78 years, most of the time in tireless activity as if she know that only a frail fragment of the things that cry out to be done could be done in the lifetime of even the most fortunate.

One has the melancholy sense that when she know death was at hand, she was contemplating not what she achieved, but what she had not quite managed to do. And I know she wanted to go--when there was no more strength to do.

Yet how much she had done--how much still unchronicled! We dare not try to tabulate the lives she salvaged, the battles--known and unrecorded--she fought, the afflicted she comforted, the hovels she brightened, the faces and place, near and far, that were given some new radiance, some sound of music, by her endeavors. What other single human being has touched and transformed the existence of so many others. What better measure is there of the impact of anyone's life?

There was no sick soul too wounded to engage her mercy. There was no signal of human distress which she did not view as a personal summons. There was no affront to human dignity from which she fled because the timid cried "danger." And the number of occasions on which her intervention turned despair into victory we may never know.

Her life was crowded, restless, fearless. Perhaps she pitied most not those whom she aided in the struggle, but the more fortunate who were preoccupied with themselves and cursed with the self-deceptions of private success.

She walked in the slums and ghettos of the world, not on a tour of inspection, nor as a condescending patron, but as one who could not feel complacent while others were hungry, and who could not find contentment while others were in distress. This was not sacrifice; this, for Mrs. Roosevelt, was the only meaningful way of life.

These were not conventional missions of mercy. What rendered this unforgettable woman so extraordinary was not merely her response to suffering; it was her comprehension of the complexity of the human condition. Not long before she died, she wrote that within all of us there are two sides. One reaches for the stars, the other descends to the level of the beasts."

It was, I think, this discernment that made her so unfailingly tolerant of friends who faltered, and led her so often to remind the smug and the complacent that "There but for the grace of God . . ."

But we dare not regard her as just a benign incarnation of good works. For she was not only a great woman and a great humanitarian, but a great democrat. I use the word with a small "d"-though it was, of course, equally true that she was a great Democrat with a capital "D." When I say that she was a great small-d democrat, I mean that she had a lively and astute understanding of the nature of the democratic process. She was a master political strategist with a fine sense of humor. And, as she said, she loved a good fight.

She was a realist. Her compassion did not become sentimentality. She understood that progress was a long labor of compromise. She mistrusted absolutism in all its forms--the absolutism of the word and even more the absolutism of the deed. She never supposed that all the problems of life could be cured in a day or a year or a lifetime. Her pungent and salt understanding of human behavior kept her always in intimate contact with reality. I think this was a primary source of her strength, because she never thought that the loss of a battle meant the loss of a war, nor did she suppose that a compromise which produced only part of the objective sought was an act of corruption or of treachery. She knew that no formula of words, no combination of deeds, could abolish the troubles of life overnight and usher in the millennium.

The miracle, I have tried to suggest, is how much tangible good she really did; how much realism and reason were mingled with her instinctive compassion; how her contempt for the perquisites of power ultimately won her the esteem of so many of the powerful; and how, at her death, there was a university of grief that transcended

all the harsh boundaries of political, racial, and religious strife and, for a moment at least, united men in a vision of what their world might be.

We do not claim the right to enshrine another mortal, and this least of all would Mrs. Roosevelt have desired. She would have wanted it said, I believe, that she well knew the pressures of pride and vanity, the sting of bitterness and defeat, the gray days of national peril and personal anguish. But she clung to the confident expectation that men could fashion their own tomorrows if the could only learn that yesterday can be neither relived nor revised.

Many who have spoken of her in these last few days have used a word to which we all assent, because it speaks a part of what we feel. They have called her "a lady," a "great lady," "the first lady of the world." But the work "lady", though it says much about Eleanor Roosevelt, does not say all. To be incapable of self-concern is not a negative virtue; it is the other side of a coin that has a positive face--the most positive, I think, of all the faces. And to enhance the humanity of others is not a kind of humility; it is a kind of pride--the noblest of all the forms of pride. No man or woman can respect other men and women who does not respect life. And to respect life is to love it. Eleanor Roosevelt loved life--and that, perhaps, is the most meaningful thing that can be said about her, for it says so much beside.

It takes courage to love life. Loving it demands imagination and perception and the kind of patience women are more apt to have than men--the bravest and most understanding women. And loving it takes something more besides--it takes a gift for life, a gift for love.

Eleanor Roosevelt's childhood was unhappy--miserably unhappy, she sometimes said. But it was Eleanor Roosevelt who also said that "one must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life." She did not mean that duty should compel us. She meant that life should. "Life," she said, "was meant to be lived." A simple statement. An obvious statement. But a statement that by its obviousness and its simplicity challenges the most intricate of all the philosophies of despair.

Many of the admonitions she bequeathed us are neither new thoughts nor novel concepts. Her ideas were, in many respects, old-fashioned--as old as the Sermon on the Mount, as the reminder that it is more blessed to give than to receive, in the words of St. Francis that she loved so well: "For it is in the giving that we receive."

She imparted to the familiar language--nay, what too many have come to treat as the cliches--of Christianity a new poignancy and vibrancy. She did so not by reciting them, but by proving that it is possible to live them.

It is this above all that rendered her unique in her century. It was said of her contemptuously at times that she was a do-gooder, a charge leveled with similar derision against another public figure born 1,962 years ago.

We who are assembled here are of various religious and political faiths, and perhaps different conceptions of man's destiny in the universe. It is not an irreverence, I trust, to say that the immortality Mrs. Roosevelt would have valued most would be found in the deeds and visions her life inspired in others, and in the proof that they would be faithful to the spirit of any tribute conducted in her name.

And now one can almost hear Mrs. Roosevelt saying that the speaker has already talked too long. So we must say farewell. We are always saying farewell in this world--always standing at the edge of loss attempting to retrieve some memory, some human meaning, from the silence--something which was precious and is gone.

Often, although we know the absence well enough, we cannot name it or describe it even. What left the world when Lincoln died? Speaker after speaker in those aching days tried to tell his family or his neighbors or his congregation. But no one found the words, not even Whitman. "When lilacs last in the dooryard bloomed" can break the heart, but not with Lincoln's greatness, only with his loss. What the words could never capture was the man himself. His deeds were known; every school child knew them. But it was not his deeds the country mourned, it was the man--the mastery of life which made the greatness of the man.

It is always so. On that April day when Franklin Roosevelt died, it was not a President we wept for. It was a man. In Archibald MacLeish's words:

"Fagged out, worn down, sick
With the weight of his own bones, the task finished,
The war won, the victory assured,
The glory left behind him for the others,
And the wheels roll up through the night in the sweet land
In the cool air in the spring between the lanterns."

It is so now. What we have lost in Eleanor Roosevelt is not her life. She lived that out to the full. What we have lost, what we wish to recall for ourselves, to remember, is what she was herself. And who can name it? But she left "a name to shine on the entablatures of truth, forever."

We pray that she has found peace, and a glimpse of sunset. But today we weep for ourselves. We are lonelier; someone has gone from one's own life--who was like the certainty of refuge; and someone has gone from the world--who was like a certainty of honor.

EULOGY FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY
UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK
NOVEMBER 26, 1963

My privilege in this sad hour is to convey to you, Mr. President, to you, Mr. Secretary-General, and to you, the assembled delegates of the world, the profound gratitude of the people of my country for what has been done and for what has been said here today. Our grief is the more bearable because it is so widely and so genuinely shared; and for this we can only say, simply but from the depths of our full hearts, thank you.

President Kennedy was so contemporary a man--so involved in our world, so immersed in our times, so responsive to its challenges, so intense a participant in the great events and great decisions of our day--that he seemed the very symbol of the vitality and the exuberance that is the essence of life itself.

Never once did he lose his way in the maze; never once did he falter in the storm of spears; never once was he intimidated. Like the ancient prophets he loved the people enough to warn them of their errors. And the man who loves his country best will hold it to its highest standards. He made us proud to be Americans.

And so it is that after 4 sorrowful days we still can hardly grasp the macabre reality that the world has been robbed of this vibrant presence by an isolated act conceived in the strange recesses of the human mind.

We shall not soon forget the late President's driving ambition for his own country--his concept of a permanently dynamic society spreading abundance to the last corner of this land and extending justice, tolerance, and dignity to all of its citizens alike.

We shall not soon forget that as the leader of a great nation he met and mastered his responsibility to wield great power with great restraint. "Our national strength matters," he said just a few weeks ago,"but the spirit which informs and controls our strength matters just as much."

We shall not soon forget that he held fast to the vision of a world in which the peace is secure, in which inevitable conflicts are reconciled by pacific means, in which nations devote their energies to the welfare of all other citizens, and in which the vast and colorful diversity of human society can flourish in a restless, competitive search for a better society.

We shall not soon forget that by word and by deed he gave proof of profound confidence in the present value and the future promise of this great organization, the United Nations.

And we shall never forget these ambitions, these visions, these convictions that so inspired this remarkable young man and so quickened the quality and tempo of our times in these fleeting past 3 years. And our grief is compounded by the bitter irony that he who gave his all to contain violence, lost his all--to violence.

Now he is gone. Today we mourn him. Tomorrow and tomorrow we shall miss him. And so we shall never know how different the world might have been had fate permitted this blazing talent to live and labor longer at man's unfinished agenda for peace and progress for all.

Yet for the rest of us, life goes on; our agenda remains unfinished. Minutes after his spirit departed, Lyndon B. Johnson took his oath of allegiance to the permanent institutions of this country, institutions which outlast violence and outlive men. These hours of mourning are then but a pause in a process--not a break in purpose or in policy.

President Johnson has directed me to affirm to this Assembly that there will be no Johnson policy toward the United Nations, any more than there was a Kennedy policy. There was--and is--only a United States policy. And that, too, outlasts violence and outlives men.

As long ago as 1948, President Johnson told an American audience that "our long-term and sustained foreign policy must include full support of the United Nations." And now, on his behalf, I repeat to you that my Government will--as it has over the years--support every practical move to add to the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace and to aid new nations to reach the stage of self-sustaining growth.

The foreign policy of this Government will continue to be, as to the troubling issues of today and tomorrow, to work for agreement where agreement is possible and to negotiate with patience and persistence until agreement is possible. President Johnson is determined that the better feeling of these past few months shall not be lost, rather that it must be increased. In that spirit we shall not falter on the stony path to peace.

Finally, let me say, as several speakers have reminded us here this afternoon, that John Kennedy never believed that he or any man was indispensable; of Dag Hammarskjold's death he said: "The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this Organization." But he did believe passionately that peace and justice are indispensable. And he believed, as he told this Assembly in 1961, that in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war. . . ."

So, my friends, we shall honor him in the best way that lies open to us--and the way he would want it to be--by getting on with the everlasting search for peace and justice for which all mankind is praying.

EULOGY FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL
NATIONAL CATHEDRAL
WASHINGTON, D.C.
JANUARY 28, 1965

Today we meet in sadness to mourn one of the world's greatest citizens. Sir Winston Churchill is dead. The voice that led nations, raised armies, inspired victories and blew fresh courage into the hearts of men is silenced. We shall hear no longer the remembered eloquence and wit, the old courage and defiance, the robust serenity of indomitable faith. Our world is thus poorer, our political dialogue is diminished and the sources of public inspiration run more thinly for all of us. There is a lonesome place against the sky.

So we are right to mourn. Yet, in contemplating the life and the spirit of Winston Churchill, regrets for the past seem singularly insufficient. One rather feels a sense of thankfulness and of encouragement that throughout so long a life, such a full measure of power, virtuosity, mastery and zest played over our human scene.

Contemplating this completed career, we feel a sense of enlargement and exhilaration. Like the grandeur and the power of the masterpieces of art and music, Churchill's life uplifts our hearts and fills us with fresh revelation of the scale and the reach of human achievement. We may be sad; but we rejoice as well, as all must rejoice when they "now praise famous men" and see in their lives the full splendor of our human estate.

And regrets for the past are insufficient for another reason. Churchill, the historian, felt the continuity of past and present, the contribution which mighty men and great events make to future experience; history's "flickering flame" lights up the past and sends its gleams into the future. So to the truth of Santayana's dictum, "Those who will not learn from the past are destined to repeat it," Churchill's whole life was witness. It was his lonely voice that in the Thirties warned Britain and Europe of the follies of playing all over again the tragedy of disbelief and of unpreparedness. And in the time of Britain's greatest trial he mobilized the English language to inspire his people to historic valor. It was his voice again that helped assemble the great coalition that has kept peace steady throughout the last decades.

"We cannot say the past is past without surrendering the future," he once said. So today the "past" of his life and his achievements are a guide and light to the future. And we can only properly mourn and celebrate this mighty man by heeding him as a living influence in the unfolding dramas of our time.

What does he tell us of this obscure future whose outlines we but dimly perceive? First, I believe, he would have us reaffirm his serene faith in human freedom and dignity. The love of freedom was not for him an abstract thing but a deep conviction that the uniqueness of man demands a society that gives his capacities full scope. It was, if you like, an aristocratic sense of the fullness and the value of life. But he was a profound democrat, and the cornerstone of his political faith, inherited from his beloved father, was the simple maxim "Trust the people." Throughout his long career, he sustained his profound concern for the well-being of his fellow citizens.

Instinctively, profoundly, the people trusted him, the peer's son. He could lead them in war because he had respected them in peace. He could call for their greatest sacrifices for he know how to express their deepest dignity--citizens of equal value and responsibility in a free and democratic state.

His crucial part in the founding of the United Nations expressed his conviction that the Atlantic Charter so audaciously proclaimed by Roosevelt and Churchill at the height of Hitler's victories would have to be protected by institutions embodying the ideal of the rule of law and international cooperation.

For him, humanity, its freedom, its survival, towered above pettier interests--national rivalries, old enmities, the bitter disputes of race and creed. His words "In victory--magnanimity; in peace--good will" were more than slogans. His determination to continue in politics after his defeat in 1945 and to toil on in the 1950's to the limit of health and of endurance sprang from his belief that he could still "bring nearer that lasting peace which the masses of people of every race and in every land so fervently desire." The great soldier and strategist was first of all a man of peace--and for perhaps the most simple reason--his respect, his faith, his compassion for the family of man.

His career saw headlong success and headlong catastrophe. He was at the height. He was flung to the depths. He saw his worst prophecies realized, his worst forebodings surpassed. Yet throughout it all his zest for living, gallantry of spirit, wry humor and compassion for human frailty took all grimness out of his fortitude and all pomposity out of his dedication.

Churchill's sense of the incomparable value and worth of human existence never faltered, for the robust courage with which he lived to the very full never faltered. In the darkest hour, the land could still be bright, and for him hopes were not deceivers. It was forever fear that was the dupe. Victory at last would always lie with life and faith, for Churchill saw beyond the repeated miseries of human frailty the larger vision of mankind's "upward ascent towards his distant goal."

He used to say that he was half American and all English. But we put that right when the Congress made him an honorary citizen of his mother's native land and we shall always claim a part of him. I remember once years ago during a long visit at his country house he talked proudly of his American Revolutionary ancestors and happily of his boyhood visits to the United States. As I took my leave I said I was going back to London to speak to the English Speaking Union and asked if he had any message for them. "Yes," he said, "tell them that you bring greetings from an English Speaking Union." And I think that perhaps it was to the relations of the United Kingdom and the United States that he made his finest contribution of all.

In the last analysis, all the zest and life and confidence of this incomparable man sprang, I believe, not only from the rich endowment of his nature, but also from a profound and simple faith in God. In the prime of his powers, confronted with the apocalyptic risks of annihilation, he said serenely: "I do not believe that God has despaired of his children." And in old age, as the honors and excitements faded, his resignation had a touching simplicity: "Only faith," he said, "in a life after death in a brighter world where dear ones will meet again--only that and the measured tramp of time can give consolation."

The great aristocrat, the beloved leader, the profound historian, the gifted painter, the superb politician, the lord of language, the orator, the wit--yes, and the dedicated bricklayer--behind all of them was the man of simple faith, steadfast in defeat, generous in victory, resigned in age, trusting in a loving providence and committing his achievements and his triumphs to a higher power.

Like the patriarchs of old, he waited on God's judgment and it could be said of him--as of the immortals that went before him--that God "magnified him in the fear of his enemies and with his words he made prodigies to cease. He glorified him in the sight of kings and gave him commandments in the sight of his people. He showed him his Glory and sanctified him in his faith . . ."